

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/608,218	Applicant(s) COSLOVI, ILARIO A.	
	Examiner Mark T. Le	Art Unit 3617	

All Participants:

 (1) Mark T. Le.

 (2) Kenneth Bousfield.
Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 11 October 1931
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
none
Claims discussed:
1, 12 and 20
Prior art documents discussed:
Reynolds (US 3,797,674)
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interviews ~~did not~~ result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: As discussed with Mr. Bousfield on January 10 and 11 2005, the examiner indicated that independent claims 1, 12 and 20 would need to be further amended to better define the instant claimed invention over the embodiments of Figures 3 and 6 of Reynold (US 3,797,674). It was agreed that the two concerned portions of independent claims 1, 12 and 20 should be amended to define that they were formed as being parts of a monolith. It was noted that a structure in the form of a monolith generally would not be a novelty; however, in the instant case, such monolith limitation would help to define the instant claimed invention over the structure of Reynolds because portions 12 and 39 of Figure 3 embodiment of Reynolds could not be made as being parts of a monolith. Said portions 12 and 39 would have to be made separately so that mounting flange 41 could be installed before a mechanical connection, such as weld 43, could be used to attach portions 12 and 39 together. On the other hand, in a different embodiment, shown in Figure 6 of Reynolds, it was noted that portions 12, 36 and 45 of the center plate were made as parts of a monolith; however, this structure was different from that of the instant claimed invention because portion 45 of Figure 6 embodiment of Reynolds extended radially beyond the center plate bowl. Mr. Bousfield indicated that he would submit a formal amendment to include the agreed changes to claims 1, 12 and 20.

On January 31, 2005, the examiner reviewed the formal amendments submitted by Mr. Bousfield on January 21, 2005, and noted that the expression "being formed from a monolith", as recited in claim 20, should be amended to be "being parts of a monolith", similar to that recited in claims 1 and 12, so as to clearly emphasize that the concerned portions were made as being parts of a monolith rather than that the concerned portions were produced from or the products of a monolith. Mr. Bousfield agreed to the proposed change as set forth in the examiner's amendment..